

### **REMARKS**

This proposed supplemental amendment is submitted in response to the final Office Action dated February 22, 2006. Claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended and claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-18 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 7, and 13 are currently pending.

### **OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Figures 8C through 14C have been labeled “Prior Art” response to the Examiner’s objections.

### **OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION**

The specification and particularly the paragraphs beginning on page 92, line 1, page 127, line 17, page 129, line 28, page 131, line 25, page 132, line 27, page 134, line 1, page 135, line 4, page 138, line 11, and page 140, line 22 have been amended in accordance with the objections specified on page 3 of the final Office Action.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

In reference item 7 beginning on page 4 of the final Office Action, claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 5 and 6 have been cancelled herein, rendering their disposition moot.

In reference item 6 on page 3 of the final Office Action, claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement by claiming subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor(s), as the time the application was filed, had possession of the claim invention. Specifically, at page 4, the final Office Action asserts that the recitation in claim 1 (and similarly for claims 7 and 13) of “to determine whether previous occurrences of the identified harvest events have been recorded in association with the simulation model” and “responsive to determining that previous occurrences of said identified harvest events have not been recorded in association with said simulation model, delivering a copy of said testcase to a harvest testcase bucket” are not supported in the specification.

In view of the rejections and numerous telephone discussions between the Examiner and the undersigned Applicants' representative, claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended in an effort to address the Examiner's concerns regarding lack of congruity between the claim language and specification description of a preferred embodiment. Namely, claim 1 (and similarly for claims 7 and 13) has been amended to replace "to determine whether previous occurrences of the identified harvest events have been recorded in association with the simulation model" with "to determine whether any preliminarily non-redundant harvest events have occurred" to more specifically describe the fact that the step of comparing the setting of the harvest event flags with the local harvest hit table is used as a preliminary check of whether the harvest events triggering the harvest event flags have occurred as supported in the specification at page 125, line 1 et seq. with reference to **FIGS. 22A-22C** (see page 126, lines 19-23, "API entry point 2202 then compares the harvest event occurrences as recorded by the status of harvest flags 423a-423n with the content of local harvest hit table 2201 to determine if any preliminarily non-redundant harvest events ... have occurred). Other changes have been made throughout claim 1 for consistency with this amended element.

Claim 1 has also been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 2 and 3 which have been cancelled accordingly. Furthermore, claim 1 now recites a step of "examining harvest event flags within said simulation model to identify harvest events triggered during said testcase execution, wherein triggering of said harvest event results in setting corresponding harvest event flags" to replace the step of "identifying harvest events triggered during said testcase execution" added in the previous Amendment A filed on January 13, 2006. Claims 7 and 13 have been similarly amended.

Regarding further amendments to claims 1, 7, and 13, the limitation reciting a "harvest testcase bucket that collects testcases for a simulation model..." is supported by the description of a harvest testcase bucket **2300** within a harvest testcase server **2210** and harvested testcases **2213a-2213n (FIG. 22a)**.

The step of "delivering a copy of said network harvest hit table as a local harvest hit table to said at least one simulation client" is supported pg. 125, lines 6-9 with reference to **FIG. 22a**.

The step of "examining harvest event flags within said simulation model to identify harvest events triggered during said testcase execution ..." is supported at pg. 126, lines 16-19.

The specification further supports the step of “comparing the setting of the harvest event flags with said local harvest hit table (pg. 125, lines 4-17 (**FIG. 22a**); pg. 126, lines 19-23 (**FIG. 22a**)) to determine whether any preliminarily non-redundant harvest events have occurred” (pg. 125, lines 4-9 (**FIG. 22a**); pg. 126, lines 21-23(**FIG. 22a**)).

The specification further supports the step of “responsive to determining that preliminarily non-redundant harvest events have occurred, delivering a copy of said testcase to said harvest testcase bucket” (pg. 126, line 23 – page 131, describing the “preliminary” redundancy determination expressly set forth in the aforementioned “comparing” step as well as a “direct” and “indirect” redundancy verification not expressly recited in claim 1; pg. 125, lines 6-9 (**FIG. 22a**)).

From the foregoing it is clear that amended claims 1, 7, and 13 are amply supported by the specification in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney of record at 512.343.6116 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Baca', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Matthew W. Baca  
Reg. No. 42,277  
Dillon & Yudell LLP  
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway  
Suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)